COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
MEETING MINUTES

January 9, 2004
9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Arizona Supreme Court
Conference Room 119
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMBERS PRESENT
Louraine Arkfeld
Kent Batty
Michael Baumstark
Christopher Cummiskey
B. Robert Dorfman
Peter Eckerstrom
Jeanne Hicks
Michael Jeanes
Donna Killoughey
Gary Kremarik
Martin Krizay
Ruth McGregor
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
Sheldon Weisberg

MEMBERS ABSENT
James Soto

GUESTS
Tom Brady, CACC
Cheryl Bowen, Greenlee Superior Court
Ron Beguin, CACC, TAC
Eric Ciminski
Janet Cornell, CACC, TAC
Dave Davis, CACC, TAC
William Edel, Maricopa County Juvenile
Beverly Frame, Yuma Superior Court
Durwin Gin, Maricopa Superior Court
Diane Green, State Board of Governors
Donald Jacobson, CACC
Kimberlee Johnson, CACC
John King, TAC
Mark Madden, Yuma Superior Court
Jeff Mangis, Yuma Superior Court
Cary Meister, TAC
Gordon Mulleneaux, CACC
Patricia Noland, CACC
Gregg Obuch, CACC, TAC
Pamela Pollock, Greenlee Superior Court
Michael Pollard, CACC
Ellie Price, TAC
Rick Rager, Tempe Municipal Court
Will Tagart, TAC
Virlynn Tinnell, Mohave Superior Court
Tonia Tunnell

AOC STAFF
Kim Bendon
Bobbie Chinsky
William Earl
Jennifer Gilbertson
Gary Graham
Maureen Haggerty
Jim Ham
Karl Heckart
J.T. Hilton
Paul Hrisho
Randy Kenney
Tim Lawler
Harvey Lowe
Adele May
Nikolee Nelsen
Stephanie Nolan
Pamela Peet
Amy Stuart
Amy Wood

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Vice Chief Justice Ruth McGregor, Chair, called the meeting of the Commission on Technology (COT) to order on January 9, 2004 at 9:30 a.m. and welcomed members and guests. She introduced two new members, Honorable Peter Eckerstom, Court of Appeals, Division II and Christopher Cummiskey, State CIO and Director of Government Information Technology Agency (GITA). Justice McGregor took roll call with members and guests introducing themselves.

The first order of business, approving the minutes of the November 14, 2004 COT meeting, resulted in discussion of the November meeting motion TECH-03-44. Discussion centered on the wording of the actual motion for record. After discussion, most members agreed that the motion was correct as stated.

MOTION: **A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 14, 2004 Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed with 12 Aye and 2 Nay votes. TECH-03-47**

Justice McGregor continued with an overview of the day's agenda and how it related to the strategic direction adopted during the COT Strategic Planning meeting of September 4 & 5, 2003. She thanked members of the COT's subcommittees, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) and the Probations Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC), for their efforts to-date and acknowledged their extraordinary efforts given the short time span provided for reporting findings to the COT.

ENTERPRISE ACHITECTURE

Karl Heckart, Chair of TAC, briefly reviewed some priorities set during the COT Strategic Planning Session to reach the Judicial Branch's goal of leveraging innovation. He noted three related priorities:

- Investigate options for a new standard Case Management System (CMS)
- Identify functional requirements for a new JOLTS
- Develop Enterprise Architecture to guide all new systems development

Karl presented, on behalf of TAC, a proposed Enterprise Architecture Standards (EAS) for the Arizona Judicial Branch that TAC was directed to develop. The EAS contains technology architecture and standards that support component based development and recognize a *bolt-on* modular development approach for enhancements to *core* applications. This approach will enable and maximize reuse and sharing of development efforts, provided change management protection, and provide a mechanism for design collaboration.

The COT's goal was to adopt Arizona Judicial Branch Enterprise Architecture Standards prior to any new systems being built or acquired to ensure leveraged innovation for core systems already in place. Karl explained the critical need for enterprise architecture describing it as a set of principles, standards and products that are applied across the Judiciary targeted at leveraging technology investments. He outlined the technical domains in critical need of enterprise architecture, went over existing standards and explained a recommended methodology for adopting new standards. New standards recommended by TAC included:

- Ad-Hoc Reporting – Crystal Enterprise
- Data Exchange – Justice XML Data Dictionary 3.0.01 (JXDD) as the XML model
- Development Environment – .NET
- Data Transformation and Routing for state-level applications – MQSI

Discussion centered on the proposed .NET environment, including funding and timing issues and the exception process. Concern was expressed about giving courts sufficient time to prepare for the budgetary and technology impacts of introducing .NET into their environments. City of Phoenix and Maricopa Superior Court stated they needed more time.

In continuation of his presentation, Karl noted the need to develop a format for detail documentation of each standard. Finally, he recommended that TAC move forward with recommendations for enterprise architecture standards for other categories, including electronic/digital signatures, audio/video file formats and security.

APPROVED

MOTION: **A motion was made and seconded to accept the Technical Advisory Council's proposed Enterprise Architecture Standards for the Arizona Judicial Branch with an effective date of 12 months after approval. The motion as amended below passed unanimously. TECH-03-48**

MOTION: **A motion was made and seconded to amend the motion TECH-03-48 pertaining to the standard for the use of .NET so that the effective date would be 18 months rather than 12 months and that use of the word "mandatory" in the explanation section of the meeting materials be eliminated. A second motion was made and seconded to amend the pending amendment that the time frame for .NET be switched to 24 months rather than 18 months. The amendment to the pending motion was accepted. The motion passed with 13 Aye and 1 Nay votes. TECH-03-49**

Justice McGregor noted that standard will have to be formalized in a proposed section of the Arizona Code of Judicial Code of Administration (ACJA) and submitted to the Arizona Judicial Council for approval. Staff would send a proposed ACJA section to members for comment.

CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Members of CACC, PACC and COT as well as a variety of court personnel from both limited and general jurisdictions, have been attending demonstrations of vendor court management systems (CMS). Honorable Michael Pollard, Co-Chair, presented an update to the COT on behalf of CACC on the CMS review effort. He began his presentation by stressing the committee's need for more time to define CMS requirements and to build a consensus among all parties involved. He outlined the initial directive given to CACC which was to determine whether to build, buy or borrow a new CMS. He summarized the current position of CACC workgroups for each of these options as follows:

Build: The committee determined the "build" option was probably least viable. After review and discussion, they think that building a CMS is time and labor intensive, expensive and holds a significant amount of risk.

Buy: The committee spent considerable time reviewing the "buy" option. They attended vendor demos and conducted a survey of participants. Michael noted good participation from court judges, clerks of court, court administrator, court managers, supervisors and field trainers. Consensus from the demo was that the vendors' financial systems needed further evaluation. He presented the results of 45 returned surveys as well as very broad cost ranges.

Borrow: The committee determined that they need to examine the "borrow" further. They need to do more analysis of iCIS for general jurisdiction use and evaluate whether it could be used in limited jurisdictions. The committee also needed more time to review other local systems, most of which were built in-house.

He summarized his presentation with the issues facing CACC (i.e. funding, the need for a court financial system module and the probable need for separate of LJ and GJ court systems) in making their determination of what option to recommend. He reviewed upcoming actions items that CACC will present at the next COT meeting.

Discussion centered on funding issues with concerns about where funding was going to come from. It was noted that more research must be done in order to present requests or strategies for funding a project of this magnitude.

JUVENILE ON-LINE TRACKING SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

Karl Heckart facilitated discussion and presented a description of the "Next Generation" Juvenile On-Line Tracking System project (JOLTS). He listed the JOLTS components that are required in the "next generation" system and discussed the progress on systems specification development that has been made to-date. Karl discussed a plan to get the project underway which included a collaborative development with AOC, Maricopa Superior Court and Pima Superior Court using the .NET architecture. The plan included the delivery of the detention module in July 2004 and all other modules by December 2006. Karl noted a key component of this new system was its integration with a new standard general jurisdiction case

management system.   There was considerable discussion regarding the differing goals and timeframes of the AOC and Maricopa Superior Court.

MOTION: **A motion was made and seconded to proceed with JOLTS development at both Maricopa Superior Court and the Administrative Office of the Courts in parallel so long as the data elements, data definitions, code tables and central repositories remain consistent. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-50**

LOCAL FUNDING PARTICIPATION

Karl Heckart presented a summary of the COT's decision at the September 6, 2002 meeting regarding local funding participation of AZTEC courts and State JCEF/TCPF funding for large volume courts. He reviewed JCEF/TCPF revenue dollars from 2001 throughout 2007. The trend showed no appreciable increase in revenue. He noted that even with the increase in subscription fees we will still have a negative balance in 2007 but the shortfall will not be as dramatic. The COT affirmed its original decision to raise local participation costs. It also reviewed and affirmed the continuation of the field trainer program.

Justice McGregor noted that the COT will need to review funding during next fiscal year.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

APPROVED